

IMPLEMENTING A 360-DEGREE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

EXECUTIVE PLANNING

**BY: Joseph Andrew Herr
District of Columbia Fire
and Emergency Medical Services
Department
Washington, D.C.**

**An applied research project submitted to the National Fire
Academy as part of the Executive Fire Officer Program**

March 1999

ABSTRACT

The lack of performance feedback for officers of the District of Columbia Fire and Emergency Services Department (DCF&EMSD) prompted a close examination of the current performance appraisal system used by the department. The problem prompting this research was that the current performance appraisal system did not provide for effective performance feedback to develop leaders and managers for the department. Effective leaders and managers play a major role in the success of any organization. The DCF&EMSD is no different from other organizations; it must provide feedback for the growth of department officers into leaders and managers.

The purpose of this research was to develop a plan to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system for the officers of the DCF&EMSD. The use of 360-degree performance appraisal systems provides the developmental instrument needed for officers as part of their overall performance evaluation process. The action research method was used. The following research questions were answered:

1. Would the officers in the 1998 research be willing to submit to another 360-degree performance appraisal?
2. Have the officers involved in the 1998 research used their 360-degree performance appraisal feedback to develop their leadership and management skills?
3. Should implementing a 360-degree performance appraisal system be a short term (six months) or a long term (two years) plan?

4. Who are the key players in the change process, and what are the critical components and sequential order of tasks that will need to be accomplished in order to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system?

The procedures used to conduct this research included: a literature review, informational interviews with experts, and follow-up interviews with the members who were part of the 1998 research.

The results showed that a 360-degree performance appraisal system provided challenging feedback, and that all the members interviewed were using this feedback to improve their development as leaders and managers. The key players, critical components and sequential order of tasks could be identified. The project will need to be a long-term (two years) process.

Recommendations included moving forward with a plan to implement a 360-degree appraisal system for officers of the department. The developed plan should be given to the contractor selected for implementing performance evaluation for the entire District Government and the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department should be selected as a pilot agency. The plan has been developed and can be reviewed in Appendix A, Plan to Implement 360-Degree Performance Appraisal System.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
Abstract	2
Table of Contents	4
Introduction.....	5
Background and Significance	7
Literature Review.....	11
Procedures	31
Results	35
Discussions	47
Recommendations	51
References	54
Appendix A - Plan to Implement a 360-Degree Performance Appraisal System.....	56
 <u>List of Tables:</u>	
Table 1: Identified Key Players for Implementation	59
Table 2: Human Resource Needs.....	62
Table 3: Equipment Needs	63
Table 4: Critical Components	63
Table 5: Work Breakdown Structure	64

INTRODUCTION

The development of leaders and managers requires them to receive performance feedback on their assigned tasks and responsibilities. Implementing a 360-degree performance appraisal system for the DCF&EMSD will provide potential leaders and managers of the department with a system that allows them to develop their leadership and management skills (Herr, 1998).

Leadership and management skills are critical to the officers at various levels of the department.

In 1998, Herr identified these officers to include: sergeant, lieutenant, captain, and battalion fire chief. The research showed that the current system of performance evaluations lacked the critical component of feedback. Officers need feedback on their strengths and weaknesses in order to develop into leaders and managers. The current system lacked this critical component.

The purpose of this research is to develop a plan to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system as a method of developing leaders and managers for the DCF&EMSD. This plan will identify key players, critical components, and a sequential order of tasks for implementation of a 360-degree performance appraisal system.

Furthermore, this research is prompted by changes in city leadership. These changes have led to demands for greater accountability and improved delivery of services by all city agencies. The new mayor, Anthony Williams, has demanded that all agency heads develop both short and long-range plans (Williams, 1999).

A 360-degree performance appraisal system supports these values, and meets the orders of Mayor Williams for agency heads to develop plans to improve city services. These plans can be short term (six months) or long term (two years).

In 1998, Herr identified three limitations to the research: (1) a small sampling (one officer from each rank: sergeant, lieutenant, captain, and battalion chief); (2) a possibly skewed sample (officers selected were all considered by the researcher to be top-notch); and (3) no follow-up component (time constraints did not provide an opportunity to see if these officers used their feedback to develop leadership and management skills).

This type of performance feedback provides officers of the department with a developmental tool to improve their leadership and management skills. It also holds them accountable for providing better customer service to their subordinates, supervisors and peers, because these are the people who rate them. If the DCF&EMSD can accomplish this internally, then both the internal and external customers of the department will benefit.

This research also attempts to determine if the limitations identified in 1998 precluded the implementation of a 360-degree performance appraisal system.

The action research method was used. The following research questions were posed:

1. Would the officers in the 1998 research be willing to submit to another 360-degree performance appraisal?
2. Have the officers involved in the 1998 research used their 360-degree performance appraisal feedback to develop their leadership and managerial skills?
3. Should implementing a 360-degree performance appraisal system be a short-term (six months) or long-term (two years) plan?
4. Who are the key players in the change process, and what are the critical components and sequential order of tasks that will need to be accomplished in order to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system?

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

The District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Authority (the Control Board) was appointed by President Clinton and Congress in 1995 to oversee the operations of the District of Columbia Government. In July 1997, the Control Board took over the day-to-day management of nine District Government agencies by an act of Congress. The Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department was one of the nine agencies. The Control board has mandated that a new employee performance evaluation system be in place by July 1, 1998, for every member of the DCF&EMSD.

In 1998, Herr noted that the current system was implement in 1958 (Public Law 85-584) and required that every uniformed member of the fire department in the District of Columbia receive a satisfactory performance rating in order to receive a service longevity step (pay) increase. This system provided no feedback that could be used to develop officers as leaders and managers. In spite of mandates issued by the Control Board to the leadership of the DCF&EMSD, this is the performance evaluation system in use today.

The department has attempted to work with the District of Columbia Office of Personnel (DCOP) on the development of a new performance evaluation system for employees. A 360-degree performance appraisal system will be the developmental instrument used in the new performance evaluation system. The department has made available the author of this paper and other personnel to work with DCOP.

District of Columbia Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department

The city of Washington, D.C. is the Capital of the United States of America. Washington, D.C. is 68.7 square miles by its boundaries. The resident population of the city is approximately 564,000. However, the Washington metropolitan area has a population of more

than 4.5 million. On typical work days, the city's population burgeons to more than two million (Cook, 1996).

In 1999, the DCF&EMSD operated with 32 engine companies, 16 ladder companies, three heavy-duty rescue squads, one hazardous materials unit, and three fireboats. In addition, the Emergency Medical Services Bureau operates 10 paramedic units and 16 ambulances. The department is under the command of the fire chief, supported by two assistant fire chiefs. The on-duty command staff includes one deputy fire chief, six battalion fire chiefs, a safety officer, and four emergency medical service supervisors. The total on-duty staff is 282 personnel. Supporting the suppression and emergency medical services operations are the Communications Division, Training Division, Fleet Maintenance Division, Fire Prevention Division and the Administrative Division.

Political Layers of the District of Columbia

There were five political layers involved in the activities of the District of Columbia Government prior to July 1995. Agencies of the District Government, like the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department, reported to the Mayor, the City Council, both Houses of Congress and at times, to the President.

The Mayor and the City Council are the elected officials of the citizens of the District of Columbia. The form of government is a strong Mayor and a less-powerful City Council. The Mayor prepares the City Budget, it is approved by the City Council, and forwarded to the United States Congress.

The United States House of Representatives' House District Committee holds hearings on the City's Budget and Laws. After approval in the House, they are forwarded to the United States Senate, which will vote for approval or amendment, and send back to the House. After

approval by both the House and Senate, Congress sends the City's Budget and Laws to the President of the United States to be signed into law or vetoed.

In July 1995, Congress and the President established the Control Board, made up of five members, to oversee the affairs of the District of Columbia Government. The Control Board has a wide range of powers, such as final approval of all city expenditures and contracts. The Chairman of the Control Board was the only individual who could fire the new Chief Financial Officer who controls all District Finances.

In July 1997, the Congress passed a bill and the President signed the bill into law. This law placed nine District Agencies under the direct control of the Control Board. The Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department reported directly to the Chairman of the Control Board. Control Board Chairman, Dr. Andrew Brimmer, directed the fire chief to develop a performance appraisal system for the agency. Dr. Brimmer later linked this mandate to a pay raise for the members of the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department in October 1998.

In September of 1998, Alice Rivlin was appointed by President Clinton as the new Chairperson of the Control Board. Ms. Rivlin's term as chairperson began at the same time as three other new members of the Control Board were sworn in to assume their duties of control of city financial matters.

In June 1998, the city's Chief Financial Officer, Anthony Williams, announced that he would run for Mayor in November 1998. Mr. Williams' decision was based on two critical factors. First, the current and long-term Mayor, Marion Barry, announced that he would not seek reelection. Second, the city finances were on solid ground, and there was a budget surplus for the first time in the District Government since the beginning of home rule in 1976.

On November 2, 1998, Anthony Williams was elected Mayor. Mayor Williams was sworn in on Saturday, January 2, 1999. On Monday, January 4, 1999, he conducted his first

cabinet meeting. In this meeting, agency heads had one week to develop short-term plans (six months) to show an improvement in the services provided to the citizens. Instructions were also given to develop long-term plans (two years) to show major changes in their agencies.

Limitations of 1998 Research

In Herr, 1998, three limitations were identified: (1) a small group consisting of one officer from each rank (sergeant, lieutenant, captain, and battalion fire chief), (2) officers selected were considered by the author to be top-notch, and (3) time did not permit follow-up to see if developmental actions would be taken by these officers. Pursuing further implementation without examination of the previous limitations would not be prudent.

The development of an action plan to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system for use by the DCF&EMSD was prepared to meet the applied requirements of the *Executive Planning* course at the National Fire Academy. The research relates to the plan development unit of the *Executive Planning* course by stating the goals of the plan, identifying the plan components, and evaluating the best methods of achieving these goals. The problem, however, is to develop an implementation plan for a 360-degree performance appraisal system for the DCF&EMSD. The results of this research will have a significant impact on the DCF&EMSD's ability to provide an effective appraisal system for officers to receive feedback on their job performance. This research will provide a plan for implementing a 360-degree performance appraisal system for officers of the department. This system will enable the officers of the DCF&EMSD to develop into leaders and managers. This development is necessary if the department is to conform with city values of greater accountability and improved delivery of services.

Due to orders from the Mayor for plans to improve services, and the mandate by the Control Board to have an annual evaluation system for every officer and member of the

department, this information comes at an opportune time. Supplying this research to those involved in decision making will allow the key players to see the potential benefits of a 360-degree performance appraisal system.

LITERATURE REVIEW

360-Degree Performance Appraisals

Literature dealing with information on 360-degree performance appraisal systems generally fits the following 1994 description of Brian O'Reilly:

You've been X-rayed, CAT scanned, poked, prodded and palpated in all the most embarrassing places. Now a kindly professional you've never met is about to pull up a folder with your name and tell you what he or she has found.

Only it's not your lower intestine that's about to be discussed, but something even more personal -- you -- your personality, the way you deal with people, your talents, values, ethics, and leadership -- and the folks who did the poking and prodding weren't anonymous technicians, but a half dozen of your closest colleagues at work. (p. 93)

In 1995, Warren Shaver echoed O'Reilly when he stated, "Finally, 360-degree feedback can be very scary for ratees. Some of the collected information can be personal, or even embarrassing. It's hard to remember that criticism is supposed to be constructive when a half dozen people have said you are too disorganized." (p.1)

The technical description used for 360-degree performance appraisal raters is qualified by Latham, (1984) in answering his question, "Who Does the Appraising?" Latham's response was, "Typically, this would include the person's superior, peers, subordinates, clients or customers, and the employee himself or herself." (p. 95) Latham, thinks the popularity of 360-degree appraisal processes is because these evaluations focus on the future.

The most effective strategy, for dealing with poor performance, is to focus on the future, rather than on the past. Focusing on the past is generally unproductive for two reasons. First, there is no way that the past can be undone. Second, it is most likely to lead to argument, due to different perceptions of past events by the appraiser and the subordinate. It is true that valuable lessons can be learned from past mistakes, but these lessons are likely to be more palatable to the learner if the emphasis is on what he or she shall do differently, starting today, than if the emphasis is mainly on the appraiser's perceptions of the employee's errors, omissions, and foul-ups. (p.97).

Peter Drucker, (1966) discussed the performance appraisals that focus on a person's weaknesses this way:

For a superior to focus on weakness, as our appraisals requires him to do, destroys the integrity of his relationship with his subordinate. The many executives, who in effect sabotage the appraisals their policy manuals impose on them, follow sound instinct. It is also perfectly understandable that they consider an appraisal interview that focuses on a search for faults, defects, and weaknesses distasteful. It is the wrong tool, in the wrong situation, for the wrong purpose. (p.85)

Drucker also stated that the focus of performance appraisals should be on strengths, not on weaknesses, and that the following four questions will achieve this goal:

- (a) What has he or she done well?
- (b) What, therefore, is he likely to be able to do well?
- (c) What does he have to learn or to acquire to be able to get the full benefit from his strength?

- (d) If I had a son or daughter, would I be willing to have him or her work under this person?
 - (i) If yes, why?
 - (ii) If no, why?

Weaknesses are seen as limitations to the full use of strength and to one's own achievement, effectiveness, and accomplishment. Question (d)(ii) above is the only question not primarily concerned with strengths. Subordinates, especially those that are bright, young, and ambitious, tend to mold themselves after a forceful boss. Therefore, there is nothing more polluted or destructive in an organization, than a forceful, and basically corrupt, executive. Such a man may operate effectively on his own, and even within an organization he may be tolerable, but only if denied all power over others. But in a position of power within an organization, he destroys. (p.87)

This change in focus of performance appraisals, described by Drucker in 1966, may have been the foundation for the type of feedback appraisals that show the strengths and identified weaknesses for would-be leaders and managers. Additionally, this type of feedback allows the leaders and managers an opportunity for growth.

In 1997, Stephanie Gruner described one of the driving forces behind the change from top down to a 360-degree process this way:

It used to be simple. Employees met with a boss for a performance review, and either got a raise or didn't. But times change. In today's flatter organizations, more and more companies realize they need feedback from persons on all levels. As a result, peer reviews and upward reviews (in which employees review their supervisors) today, supplement the traditional top-down reviews in some

companies. Now, with the latest evolutionary 360-degree reviews, the performance evolution has come full circle.

Hymes, (1996) describes an example of why the fire service needs feedback from subordinates to company officers. The following example explains why there is difficulty in achieving such feedback:

Can I speak to you a second Chief? Sure, Tom. What's up? I'd like to talk about a little problem at our station, if I could. I thought that's what captains were for, I teased. Well, the problem is the Captain. It's been going on for a long time; everyone's reluctant to bring it to you. We keep thinking it'll cure itself, but it hasn't.

He went on to present a picture of an autocratic-type supervisor, maybe even a touch despotic, who ran the company with an iron fist and who stifled initiative with sarcastic and demeaning retorts.

The type of supervisor he was describing was the bad example we all read about in our personnel administration books, but this was not the captain I knew. I found the story unbelievable; even questioning my own critical perception of others, perhaps unwilling to admit my own naivete. However, candid conversation with present and past subordinates proved the situation quite true, maybe even understated. A confrontation loomed.

Because fire stations create a decentralized workplace, battalion chiefs and officials at more senior levels, seldom achieve close contact with subordinate supervisors. We can't monitor supervisory skills as directly as we would like. We generally observe the company's performance and take our cues from there. Since we, as managers, are charged with tremendous responsibility in terms of

employee development, we require feedback from every angle to ensure that our subordinates are adequately and appropriately trained. (p. 109)

There has been rapid growth in the use of 360-degree performance appraisals. In O'Reilly's article, several private industry executives are quoted on their feelings concerning the use of 360-degree performance appraisals. The following quotes are some of the examples:

Several feedback experts single out "untrustworthy" as the most devastating single criticism for most people. "Bad listener" stings. Words indicating that your judgment and thinking are sub-par will rattle almost anyone, says Susan Gebelein, a Vice President at Personnel Decisions, Inc., a big human resources consulting company in Minneapolis. "Those are the core competencies", she says.

What's most interesting about feedback isn't the pain it causes the mechanics of its operation or its growing popularity. It's the huge variety of unpredictable comments -- and potential learning -- that it delivers. Most people are surprised by what they hear. Only a fraction of managers have a good grasp of their own abilities. Those with certain blind spots are routinely judged "less-effective" by co-workers. (p.94)

Gebelien goes on to say: "Feedback delivers its wallop and generates change depending on what a person and the organization values. If they care about relationships with others, it will have an effect in that area. If they emphasize management planning, it will have an impact there. (p.100)

The President of Raychem, a 1.5 billion electronics and electrical company in California, says that he didn't get any major surprises about himself, but was

intrigued to learn that he wasn't fooling his subordinates either. They told Robert Saldich that he wasn't good at contingency planning. (p.94)

Most revealing to Joe Malik, manager of a team of engineers for AT&T, was that his subordinates expected things of him he'd never imagined. "I found out that I need to articulate the vision and mission of our little unit. I was surprised -- not because I pride myself on my visioning -- but because we're a heads-down organization working on network products for the phone system. Most people want to know where we're going, and whether the managers' heads are screwed on right, and what I aspire the business to be."

Many companies are using feedback for cultural change to accelerate the shift to teamwork and employee empowerment (p.94).

William J. Miller, a research supervisor at Du Pont, helped install a feedback system for 80 scientists and support people several years ago. A high or low score didn't predict a scientist's ability to invent Teflon, says Miller. But what feedback did was really improve the ability of people to work in a team. Their regard for each other and behaviors that were damaging and self-centered are what changed (p.100).

The growth of 360-degree performance appraisals was expressed by Stephanie Gruner this way: "There's no doubt that 360-degree reviews are trendy. A study last year by the American Management Association revealed 13% of companies surveyed performed 360-degree reviews, and the number is growing."

Performance appraisals of leaders and managers should be designed to measure these leaders and managers against the values of the organization. The appraisals may be trendy, but they are not a fad, according to Warren Shaver, Jr. (1995), who stated:

One thing is for sure -- this is not a fad. Use of multi-rater systems has been increasing for years. Consultants Ellen Van Velsor and Stephen J. Wall say the number of off-the-shelf feedback instruments alone have quadrupled from 1982 to 1992. More are being developed both commercially and privately all the time.

(p.1)

In 1996, Rafael Colon, who is the Administrator of Management Education and Developmental Services for the Washington State Department of Personnel, wrote about Washington State's use of 360-degree assessments in public-sector management:

These are extraordinary times for managers in all fields of endeavor. The working environment, technology, work force, customer expectations, and the very nature of work itself, are all undergoing revolutionary and constant change. In this changing world, time-honored conventions of management practices cannot be counted on to garner the same results as they did in the past. While they strive to keep up with the changes in the workplace, managers must deal with the additional challenges of downsizing, accountability, and ethical dilemmas.

"In addition to these challenges, managers in the public sector must find ways to meet increasing demands for service with declining resources and satisfy the public's expectations for higher quality services. To do this, government managers must find ways to manage smarter, increase efficiency, and improve services.

Management Excellence Through Assessment's (META) 360-degree review is a full perspective feedback and developmental process that enables managers to see themselves as others see them. Perspectives from staff, peers, and supervisors are

synthesized and returned in a confidential report that portrays both management strengths and development needs. The focus of the instrument is to strengthen management and leadership practices considered critical for successful performance in the public sector. (p. 1)

In 1998, Herr relates that the 360-degree performance appraisal system described above was performed on him when he states: “Shaver discusses the same generic process as described by Colon and O’Reilly. Remarkably, this is the type of process that was performed on me by the George Washington University’s Center for Excellence in Municipal Management (the ‘Center’), a program for District Government Employees. (p.18)

Herr’s research in 1998 involved interviews to support implementing a 360-degree performance appraisal system for the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department. On October 2, 1998 [1997], in an interview with Mark Bigelow of the Center for Excellence in Municipal Management, he explained that the 360-degree performance appraisals used by the Center was a program owned by the District of Columbia Government. It had been purchased from the United States Government and was developed by the Office of Personnel Management. Mr. Bigelow explained that the Program was originally called “USA Careers” and that there were many different types of employee classifications and performance appraisals for these classifications. He went on to explain that it was a computer-based system, and that he was performing the data entry from the information on each form. However, Mr. Bigelow noted this was not the way the system was designed to be used. During this discussion, Mr. Bigelow stated that the District of Columbia Office of Personnel’s Center for Work Force Development would be a good source of information on how the USA Careers System would be used by agencies of the District Government.

In two subsequent interviews with the District of Columbia Office of Personnel's Center for Workforce Development's Director, Dr. David J. Pass, and Training Manager, Ms. Gillian Myers, valuable information was gained into the development and use of the USA Careers program for the District Government Agencies.

During an interview with Dr. Pass on April 3, 1998, he explained that the history of the USA Careers program started about three to four years ago when the United States Office of Personnel Management decided to simplify job classification. The intention was to broadband many of the current classifications into areas that required common skills. The common skills were broken down into three bands: Managerial Supervisor, Executive (Professional and Administrative), and Clerical and Technical. The intention was to have jobs that would have not only common skills, but also transferable skills.

Employees of the District Government were part of the consortium that worked on this project for the Federal Government. This consortium develop two programs -- one was the 360-degree assessment program, USA Careers -- and the other was titled Human Resource Manager.

The Human Resource Manager would assist human resource managers with matching skills and job classifications. USA Careers would provide assessments of employees that would identify strengths and weaknesses, plus provide a developmental plan for the employee. In some cases, the employee may find that it would be in their best interest to change job classifications.

When asked about the use of 360-degree performance appraisals for pay and promotions, Dr. Pass explained that there were certain factors that would have to be considered. First, that the assessment was designed to be private for the ratee, and that the effectiveness of 360-degree appraisals was based, in part, on it being confidential. Second, if these assessments were going to be shared with supervisors, then all persons involved would be informed up front. Dr. Pass

agreed that the 360-degree performance appraisal could be used as the basis for a performance contract and that the exceeding of objectives could be linked to higher pay.

Linking USA Careers to the agencies of the District Government was the responsibility of the Center for Workforce Development's Training Manager, Ms. Gillian Myers. In a personal interview on April 7, 1998, Ms. Myers explained the ability of District Government Agencies to use the USA Careers Program. She explained that it was a computer-based system that could be used on the District Government Internet. Each office would have a password, and the password would open the program to allow for data to be entered. However, only the person being assessed could gain access to the data in its completed form. This would allow the assessment to be confidential.

The system is currently set up as a model at the personnel office. In the near future, the system would be offered at six career assessment centers, which would be located at facilities throughout the District Government. Ms. Myers felt that this program, when in place, would fit into the technology plans for all District Government Agencies, and would be a cost-effective method to conduct 360-degree performance appraisals. (p.19).

The interviews with Myers, Pass and Bigelow confirmed that it is logistically feasible to implement a 360-degree system. The writings of O'Reilly, Shavers, Latham, Drucker, Gruner, Hymes, and Col'on, provided the factual information that a 360-degree performance appraisal system could be an effective performance feedback system for use in the DCF&EMSD. (p.19)

Strategic Plan For Implementing a 360-Degree Performance Appraisal

Successful planning will result in smooth implementation of change in an organization.

In 1995, Bryson wrote the following about organizational change:

I define strategic planning as a disciplined effort to produce fundamental decisions and actions that shape and guide what an organization is, what it does, and why it does it. To deliver the best results, strategic planning requires broad, yet effective, information gathering, development and exploration of strategic alternatives, and an emphasis on future implications of present decisions.

Strategic planning can help facilitate communication and participation, accommodation divergent interests and values, foster wise and reasonable analytic decision-making, and prompt successful implementation. In short, at its best, strategic planning can prompt in organizations the kind of imaginative commitment -- that psychotherapist and theologian, Thomas Moore, thinks are necessary to deal with individuals' life conundrums. (p.5)

Political decision-making is the thread that makes the strategic planning process work for private, profit and nonprofit organizations. Every organization has politics, and any strategic plan must have been thought out with the politics of the organization in mind. The plan must achieve consensus on the organizational goals and policies and programs and actions, in order to survive the political challenges of the internal and external environment of the organization. The term used by Bryson to describe how organizations can implement their strategic plans is "Strategy Change Cycle." (p.23)

There are ten steps in Bryson's Strategy of Change Cycle. These steps include:

- (i) agreeing on a strategic planning process;

- (ii) identifying organizational mandates;
- (iii) clarifying organizational missions and values;
- (iv) assessing external and internal strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats;
- (v) identifying the strategic issues facing the organization;
- (vi) formulating strategies to manage these issues;
- (vii) reviewing and adopting the strategic plans;
- (viii) establishing an effective organizational vision;
- (ix) developing an effective implementation process; and
- (x) reassessing strategies.

These are the steps that Bryson believes leads to actions, results and evaluations. (p.24)

Like Bryson , John Kotter has developed an eight-stage process of creating major change.

The eight steps are: (i) establishing a sense of urgency, (ii) creating the guiding coalition, (iii) developing a vision and strategy, (iv) communicating the change vision, (v) empowering broad-based actions,(vi) generating short-term wins, (vii) consolidating gains and producing more change, and (viii) anchoring new approaches in the culture. (p.21).

Establishing a vision is part of Kotter's eight-step change process that discusses leadership versus management. The leader must share the vision, and constantly communicate the vision, with the organization's stakeholders. The leadership in a change process must empower members of the organization to overcome obstacles, encourage risk taking, create an environment where members of the organization can see the accomplishment, and the accomplishments are celebrated. Developing managers into leaders become part of the organization's culture. (p.21).

Organizations that successfully complete a transformation feel compelled to change due to a sense of urgency. Establishing a sense of urgency is the first step in Kotter's change process. (p.35)

On January 2, 1999, a sense of urgency began in the District of Columbia Government. This was the inauguration day of Anthony Williams, Mayor of Washington, D.C. Mayor Williams took over the leadership from the much-embattled Marion Barry. Mr. Barry was stripped of all power for running the day-to-day operation of the city by the Control Board. The Control Board then hired a Chief Management Officer who ran the city and reported to the Control Board.

Mayor Williams and the Control Board entered into a Memorandum of Agreement, dated January 2, 1999, which returned power to the Mayor for running the day-to-day operation of the city. The government of the District of Columbia is now unified under the direction and control of the Mayor. All agency and department heads will now report to the Mayor. The Chief Management Officer shall report to the Mayor and shall provide advice and assistance to the Mayor in the discharge of his duties.

Mayor Williams will establish performance agreements with agency heads. In the next few weeks, he will be meeting with agency heads and top managers to establish new performance agreements based on priorities and action plans that he will ask agency heads to implement.

The paramount goal of the Williams administration is to build upon the foundation as set forth in this Memorandum of Agreement. Our goals are common -- to deliver services to citizens of the District of Columbia in a timely and efficient manner. This goal will be achieved in the shortest possible time under a unified and coordinated District government (Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department Memorandum, Number 9, Series 1999).

On Monday, January 4, 1999, all agency and department heads met with the new Mayor. The Mayor again established a sense of urgency and introduced his guiding coalition. His vision and strategies had been established during his campaign for Mayor, and these were communicated to the agency and department heads.

The Mayor currently plans to empower the agency and department heads to develop broad-based action plans for both the short term and long term. He wanted short-term plans that would produce visible wins in the next six months. The long-term plans were to be developed for implementation over the next two years. (Williams Administration Themes, Priorities and Strategies)

The sense of urgency generated by Mayor Williams' powers surfaced on Thursday, January 7, 1999, when the Chief Management Officer (CMO), Dr. Camille Cates Barnett, resigned her position. Dr. Barnett stated that she felt she had accomplished her goal of leading the city government for the Control Board over the past year. She also felt that it was time for her to move on. Dr. Barnett and Mayor Williams had clashed during the time she was CMO and he was the Chief Financial Officer. The agreement between the Control Board and the Mayor stripped the CMO of her power, and she is now reporting to the Mayor, rather than the Control Board.

Dr. Barnett had accomplished many things in her first year, but she still had several plans that remained in developmental stages. The Control Board had demanded that there be a performance evaluation system in place for all District government employees. On November 27, 1998, a request for a proposal was issued by the District of Columbia's Office of Personnel (DCOP). The request was for the new performance evaluation system. In the "Request for Proposal", the deliverables section required a 360-degree performance appraisal component.

The contractor is to develop a system merge with Current Human Resources and Operating Environments. The contractor shall merge the existing components with the District's environment, including USA Careers (a competency-based system and 360-Degree Assessment), and HR manager (performance appraisal component).

System Implementation: The contractor shall provide a plan for a pilot of the new system within various types of agencies with DCOP oversight.

Performance Evaluation Forms: These forms should include space for multiple raters.

On-line/Information Technology Component: This component will integrate the new performance evaluation system into the District's computer infrastructure.

(p.12)

The contract has not been awarded at the writing of this research. The author has been asked to be a representative for the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department to DCOP on this city-wide project.

Fire Chief Donald Edwards would like the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department to be selected as a pilot program agency when the contract is awarded to a vendor. In order for the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department to become a pilot program agency, there needs to be a plan available for the selected vendor to use and build on.

In an interview on January 11, 1999 with Ms. Crystal Marrow, DCOP Office of Policy, Standards, and Judicial Review, and Project Liaison with other agencies, she explained that the city had to make sure that the selected vendor could make the system work for the entire District government. Agencies could develop their own plans for implementation, but the vendor would be responsible for integrating all agency plans into the entire district government system.

She felt that if the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department developed an implementation plan prior to the contract being awarded, then the selected vendor could take advantage of the plan. She also felt that the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department would be an excellent agency for a pilot program. Her opinion was based on three specific factors -- first, the number of members enrolled in the Center for Excellence in Municipal Management, second, the prior research project conducted by this author, and third the size of the agency.

Project Management Plan For Implementing A 360-Degree Performance Appraisal System

Implementing a 360-degree performance appraisal system in an agency the size of the DCF&EMSD will require both a strategic plan and a project management plan. This new system will require a change in how the department conducts itself as an organization.

Bryson and Alston, 1995, explain that the strategic plan must conduct an assessment of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats that could prevent the success of implementation of a strategic plan. (p. 19)

In 1996, the Project Management Institute's (PMI) "A Guide To The Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK)" states that "Projects are often critical components of the performing organization's business strategy. For example, a couple of the projects include effecting a change in the structure and staffing or styling of an organization." (p.4).

Frame, 1995, discussed the dynamics of the project life cycle. He identified that there must be a need prior to project selection, followed by project planning, project implementation, project control, and evaluation and termination. However, there is constant feedback to the prior steps, (except termination) and the feedback process constantly returns to project selection. His logic is that projects involve future commitments and costs. Therefore, organizations must always look to maximize opportunities when selecting and implementing a project. (p.9)

Projects that fail are the result of not properly assessing the politics of the project. Frame lists the following items that must constantly be examined as part of the project manager's political assessment:

1. assess the environment;
2. identify the goals of the principal actors;
3. assess your own capabilities;
4. define the problem;
5. develop solutions; and
6. test and refine the solutions.

The first four are designed to help project professionals acquire a realistic view of what is happening. Most project professionals, when tackling a project, skip over those steps and immediately begin offering solutions to problems. They are not good project politicians. Because all projects involve politics, and since these politics often have an important bearing on whether projects proceed smoothly or roughly, it is worthwhile to examine these steps in some detail. (p.48)

In 1997, Dr. William G. Wells, Jr., an Associate Professor, Department of Management Science, School of Business and Public Management of the George Washington University in 1997, discussed the key features of a project to include the following: (p.8):

- consists of a finite set of tasks;
- is aimed at achieving some specified objective(s);
- is unique;
- often serves multiple purposes;
- has a specified duration, beginning and end; and
- possesses many interdependencies and interrelationships.

Dr. Wells also answers the question of what is project management, by identifying the key features:

- a single point of contact or control;
- high levels of coordination, sequencing and integration;
- coping with the meshing of interfaces;
- cuts across the organization;
- often deals with conflict resolution;
- dealing with uniqueness and customization.

Another definition for project management is the process of bringing a project to a successful conclusion as efficiently and effectively as possible, finishing on a timely basis, within budget, according to specifications, and with a high level of satisfaction by the customer and project team. (p10).

Bryson and Alston explain that step 1 of the strategic planning process is to develop the initial agreement among key decision-makers and opinion leaders about the overall plan. The agreement will establish support for worthiness and that the scope of plan identifies organizations, units, groups, or persons who should be involved or informed, the tasks involved, activities and time frames for completions and reports, that a committee coordinates the plan's process policies and directions, that there are teams to set up the day-to-day process and project the daily needs of the plan, that resource requirements are available before the effort begins, and that there are process champion(s) to advocate for the process. (p.30).

In 1986, Dennis P. Slevin and Jeffery K Pinto developed a framework for project implementation. It was based on their research of successfully completed projects where the project manager identified ten critical factors for success. (p.57)

1. Project Mission: Initial clarity of goals and general direction.

2. Top Management Support: Willingness of top management to provide the necessary resources and authority/power for project success.
3. Project Schedule/Plan: A detailed specification of the individual action steps required for the project implementation.
4. Client Consultation: Communication, consultation, and active listening to all impacted parties.
5. Personnel: Recruitment, selection and training of necessary personnel for the project team.
6. Technical Tasks: Availability of the required technology and expertise to accomplish the specific technical steps to accomplish the specific technical action steps.
7. Client Acceptance: The act of selling the final project to its ultimate intended users.
8. Monitoring and Feedback: Timely provision of comprehensive control information at each phase in the implementation process.
9. Communications: The provision of an appropriate communication network and necessary data to key factors in the project implementation.
10. Trouble -Shooting: Ability to handle unexpected crises and deviations from plan.

Dr. Wells echoed many of these items in his list of Critical Success and Failure Features of Project Management. He states, “when these factors are appropriately considered, projects are more likely to succeed. When not, they tend to fail.”

Top management must make the commitment in time and resources. Senior managers (champions) must follow, guide and support what happens, and an overall game plan must be devised.

Characteristics of Project Manager: Competence of the project manager (administratively, interpersonally and technically) and the amount of authority available.

Power and Politics: The degree of political activity within the organization and the perception of the project as advancing the self interests of members of the organization.

Environmental Events: The likelihood of external organizational or environmental factors impact on the operations of the project team, either positively or negatively.

Urgency: The perception of the importance of the project or the need to implement it as soon as possible. (p.38).

The most urgent need of this project will be the availability of the District Government Internet to all members of the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department. The computer-based 360-degree performance appraisal system used by the District government is the USA Careers Program.

On January 14, 1999, an interview was conducted with Mr. Daniel Weiss, the Management Information Systems Director for the DCF&EMSD. Mr. Weiss stated that the entire department should have online capabilities by the middle of May 1999. The delay was being caused by the need for several of the older fire stations to be wired with the proper telephone lines that are capable of carrying data.

When I asked Mr. Weiss if he felt that the USA Careers Program would be difficult to teach the department members to use, he stated that he felt it would not require a great deal of time to train members to use the system and that it would be like teaching people how to use

e-mail. He feels that it will be necessary to train several members of the department, so that they, in turn, can train the other officers. These same members would then train the remaining department members on the system and computers. The trainers would also act as the technical support people so there would always be someone on duty who could help the people in the stations with computer problems.

The internal documents of the DCF&EMSD and the DCOP; the interviews with Mr. Weiss, Ms. Marrow, Ms. Myers, Dr. Pass, and Mr. Bigelow; and the writings of Frame, Wells, Selvin, Pinto, Bryson, Alston, Kotter, Williams, Herr, O'Reilly, Shavers, Latham, Drucker, Gruner, Hymes, Colon, and the PMI all support the conclusion that a 360-degree performance appraisal system can and should be implemented by the DCF&EMSD.

PROCEDURES

This action research project began with a review of published materials at the Gelman Library located on the campus of George Washington University in Washington, D.C. and at the Emergency Training and Learning Resource Center, in February 1998 and September 1998. Additional reviews were conducted at the George Washington University's Center for Excellence in Municipal Management, the District of Columbia Office of Personnel's Center for Workforce Development/Skills Development Institute, the Office of Policy, Standards and Judicial Review, the DCF&EMSD Training Academy, and the author's personal library, between October 1997 and January 1999.

The literature review for this project was two-pronged -- first, to review information about the use of 360-degree performance appraisals -- and second, to gather information that supports the development of a plan to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system to be used by the DCF&EMSD.

Interviews were conducted on October 2, 1997, and throughout this project, with Mark Bigelow of the George Washington University's Center for Excellence in Municipal Management, with the final interview conducted on January 26, 1999. Dr. David J Pass, Director, District of Columbia Office of Personnel's Center for Workforce Development was interviewed on April 3, 1998. Ms Gillian Myers, Training Manager, District of Columbia Office of Personnel's Center for Workforce Development was interviewed on April 7, 1998 and throughout this project, with the final interview conducted on February 5, 1999. Ms. Crystal Marrow, District of Columbia Office of Personnel's Office of Policy, Standards, and Judicial Review, was interviewed on January 11, 1999. Mr. Danny Weiss, Director, Management Information Systems, District of Columbia Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department was interviewed on January 14, 1999. Follow-up questions were directed to these individuals throughout this project as technical or historical information was discovered.

In Herr, 1998, a pilot program using a 360-degree performance appraisal was conducted on four officers of the department. The pilot program was conducted within the guidelines established Fire Chief Donald Edwards.

After much discussion on 360-degree performance appraisals, Fire Chief Edwards granted permission for me to conduct a pilot program using 360-degree performance appraisals. The fire chief wanted the pilot program to have the following boundaries to prevent any misunderstandings between labor and management:

The pilot program was to use four volunteers, one from each of the following ranks in the department: sergeant (lowest level supervisor), lieutenant (assigned as platoon company officer), captain (assigned as company commander and platoon company officer), battalion fire chief (battalion commander and incident commander). These officers would represent the racial diversity of the department.

Each volunteering officer would have a 360-degree performance appraisal conducted on them. These officers would be rated by their supervisors, peers, subordinates, and themselves, using an instrument with 45 questions that measured 19 competencies. Mr. Bigelow conducts assessment reviews for the Center for Excellence in Municipal Management. These volunteers were then given approximately one month to reflect on their appraisal. Subsequently, I conducted an interview with each using the same questions to gain insight into their experience of having received a 360-degree performance appraisal. (p.22).

During this project, each of the four officers used in the pilot program in 1998 were again interviewed to gather information on each individual's willingness to have another 360-degree performance appraisal performed on them. In addition, they were asked how they had pursued improving their leadership and management skills based on their 1998 feedback. These interviews provided information that was used as part of the development of the answers to the research questions posed for this project.

The plan to be perfected will strive to identify key players, critical components and a sequential order for implementing a 360-degree performance appraisal system for the DCF&EMSD . To assist in the development of this plan, a computer program by the name of Microsoft Project will be used.

Limitations

This research could have been flawed by several factors. First, the development of an implementation plan for a 360-degree performance appraisal system for the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department will be a political decision. The current political environment appears to support implementation of a 360-degree performance appraisal as part of a new Performance Evaluation System for the entire District government. However, with the changes in the political leadership, those plans could be changed. Currently, the District of Columbia

government has not entered into an agreement with a vendor to develop and implement a city-wide performance evaluation system.

Second, the information that was used to develop the plan was based on several different sources who support the concept of developing a plan to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system for the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department. The foundation of the plan is built on time frames that will require the support of both the fire chief, and the leadership of DCOP. Without their support, this plan will not be successful.

Third, the computer program used for this project, Microsoft Project, is one of approximately 350 off-the-shelf programs that are designed to assist with project management. However, this program lacks the ability to capture the changes that result from tasks never being started or completed. The computer program requires information to be entered before it can develop a schedule for completion.

Fourth, the officers used in both this project, and the 1998 project, are top-notch officers, so they have taken advantage of the developmental qualities of a 360-degree performance appraisal system. If a large group or a random group was selected for a pilot program, then the result may not have been so favorable for implementing a 360-degree performance appraisal system.

Definitions

BROAD-BANDING OF JOB CLASSIFICATIONS. This is a newer concept that allows for a different method of classifications of employees to allow employers more flexibility in assigning compensation levels. In addition, it allows employers to utilize manpower with more flexibility. For example, it will eliminate many job titles that tend to intimidate employees. Broad-banding reduces the number of pay grades, which prevents grade switching to achieve pay increases. Also, it facilitates more of a team-oriented reward system.

Murder Board. A group of senior managers in an organization who have projects presented to them. They ask questions and have the ability to support or kill projects. It is used to promote buy in.

Project Management. Is completing a project on time, with in budget, according to specification, and to the satisfaction of the customer and the project team.

Ratee. The person who is the subject of the performance appraisal.

Rater. Is a person who is completing a performance appraisal questionnaire on the ratee.

RESULTS

1. Would the officers in the 1998 research be willing to submit to another 360-degree performance appraisal?

The information to answer this question was developed by interviewing each of the members that participated in the 1998 research and evaluating their responses. Each of the officers were asked if they would be willing to submit to another 360-degree performance appraisal. All officers responded yes.

The sergeant who had been promoted to lieutenant responded that with the promotion came more responsibilities that required greater leadership and management skills. He has used the feedback he received in 1998 and the categories of the 360-degree performance appraisal to constantly critique his daily actions. He feels that by knowing the categories the raters could use to evaluate him makes him much more conscious of his actions.

For example, on his first day as a lieutenant, he had a meeting with his platoon and explained what he expected from firefighters assigned to each position on the apparatus. He believes that he has set high standards for his company. He also realized that his ability to train, coach, and mentor these firefighters could be critical if they were to become more professional

and confident in their duties. He went on to say that he felt his predecessor had never challenged these firefighters to become better individuals or team players. He is confident that the members of his company are now better individuals and team players.

The lieutenant from the 1998 research felt that he had some problem areas that he has been working on over the last ten months. He was transferred about the same time as he received his 360-degree performance appraisal feedback in 1998. When he arrived at his new assignment, the company received a new ladder truck to be placed in service as the company apparatus. (This is a major project and the department is only allowed thirty days to place new apparatus in service.) He had limited experience as a truck company officer, and felt he would have to depend on his crew to assist him in making decisions on how the equipment would be placed on the new ladder truck. This example showed that he had learned to empower and to lead and follow when the situation called for it. He feels certain that he has made major improvements as a result of receiving feedback from the 360-degree performance appraisal performed on him in 1998. His comments appear to support his certainty.

The captain from the 1998 research has also been transferred to a new assignment. His new assignment offered the challenge of replacing a very popular captain with the company members of a specialized unit. Neither his predecessor or he requested to be transferred, and there was plenty of ill feelings towards him as the replacement for the popular captain. He felt that knowing his strengths from his 360-degree performance appraisal gave him the confidence he needed to deal with the situation. He was highly rated on his appraisal and used the same techniques that had been successful for him in other companies. Today he feels confident that the members of the company support him the same way they supported his predecessor. He reminded me of his comment from my 1998 research when he stated, "I thought it focused on

leadership and team building, and was a well-rounded look at all the aspects of what I do everyday.” (Herr, 1998, p.30).

The battalion fire chief said he would gladly submit to another 360-degree performance appraisal. Over the past ten months, he has felt that he has worked hard on his feedback, and feels that he is more effective in his position now, then he was ten months ago. He went on to explain that he enjoyed being able to review his feedback. He uses it as a benchmark, which keeps him more focused on how he performs his duties.

These responses clearly demonstrate that receiving 360-degree feedback was something that these members welcomed. These responses were anticipated, but the members had not been questioned about their experience concerning their 360-degree performance appraisal in ten months. Therefore, answering this question would provide a foundation to move forward with developing a plan. In 1998, Herr identified additional support for developing an implementation plan for a 360-degree performance appraisal system for the department.

Teamwork is preached in every level of the fire service. However, many times it is lacking, as was pointed out by Hymes (1996) in the example of the captain in charge of the station (p.109). Full circle or 360-degree performance appraisals will make people more accountable to their subordinate, peers and supervisors. Feedback is received from all levels in their appraisal. In many cases, it is anonymously, but if the feedback is the same from every level, it becomes hard to dispute.

During their interviews, the officers involved in the pilot program were asked about recommending the use of 360-degree performance appraisals. Some of their comments were, “I strongly recommend it for officers. It could be tailored to the various ranks in the department to allow for more focus on the objectives of the department. When a person has a problem area explained to them, and are given some goals to strive for, it can really be something positive.

Officers will gain insight into their leadership styles, plus their strong and weak areas. These statements are an indication that the department can achieve better accountability and improved customer services internally which can quickly become external values.

2. Have the officers involved in the 1998 research used their 360-degree performance appraisal feedback in a plan to develop their leadership and management skills?

The members involved in the 1998 research have all used their feedback in the development of a plan to improve their leadership and management skills.

The comment by Gebelien, “Feedback delivers its wallop and generates change depending on what a person and the organization values. If they care about relationships with others, it will have an effect in that area. If they emphasize management planning, it will have an impact there.” (O’Reilly, 1994, p.100). Each of the officers involved has developed some type of plan based on their feedback.

The sergeant, who is now a lieutenant since receiving his feedback, developed a method to critique his leadership and management skills. He developed a system where he writes down his actions in different situations. Then he performs a self-critique on these actions and writes down what lessons he has learned, and how he may handle each situation better the next time. He then meets with a coach/ mentor each month to discuss his self-critiques.

These discussions have benefited both the lieutenant and his coach/mentor. The lieutenant receives feedback and advice, and the coach/mentor gains insight into the problems of company officers that do not confront him on a daily basis.

The lieutenant in the 1998 research has established some short and long-term goals. His short-term goal was to attend a training class on problem-solving, which he has accomplished. His long-term goal was to complete his Bachelor of Science Degree, which he will accomplish in

the Fall of 1999. He is planning to further his training by focusing on leadership and management skills over the summer. He believes he has made the most of his feedback and also conducts self-evaluations of his actions.

The captain in the 1998 research is currently enrolled in the Center for Excellence in Municipal Management Program and is also attending college courses through the department's University of the District of Columbia College Program. Through self-report, he is very observant and constantly seeks feedback on his skills.

In the 1998 research when asked, "Having received this feedback, did it help you focus on how you can develop skills that will make you a better leader and manager, this captain replied:

"To be honest, I'm the type of person who watches other people whom I consider to be the best at what they do, and try to learn from them. I enjoy learning new things and try to stay current. I also have a desire to stay at the top of the line in my skills. I have several areas to work on, and I will try anything to make me better at what I do. I know that I will be taking some type of training to get better." (Herr, 1998, p.27).

The battalion fire chief involved in the 1998 research has been attending conferences and courses to help improve on area such as planning and time management. He credits the feedback from his 360-degree performance appraisal with his seeking these training opportunities. His job requires him to maintain labor relations with the four unions that make up the nearly 1800 employees of the department. He feels he has grown as a result of the feedback he received in 1998.

These officers have all used their feedback to improve their skills, the quote below appears to talking about these officers.

“Improving their skills and behaviors develop leaders and managers by making them accountable for their own improvement. The best way to look at a 360-degree performance appraisal system is as a source of information that make better leaders and managers.” (Shaver, 1995, p.13).

3. Should implementing a 360-degree performance appraisal system be a short term (six months) or a long-term (two years) plan?

The implementation of a 360-degree performance appraisal system should be a long-term (two year) plan based on the criteria identified by Mayor Williams in his Themes, Priorities, and Strategies (1999).

Strategy #1: Identify short term, visible service improvement action plans that our residents, visitors, and business communities can observe, measure and benefit from.

- Short term -- visible results within six months to one year;
- Resources - use existing full time employee (FTE) and budget resources.

Strategy #2: Develop, or define, action plans to implement permanent meaningful improvements in how the District government conducts its business.

- Long term - up to two years;
- Resources - recognize possible need for additional infrastructure investments;
- Resources - anticipate realizing significant efficiencies and cost savings.

Comparison of Short Term and Long Term Action Plans

<u>Strategy #1</u>	<u>Strategy #2</u>
Timeline	Timeline
*Now to 1 year	*Now to 2 years
Resources	Resources
*Use existing resource base	*Identify and implement efficiencies
(FTEs, \$ budget)	
Infrastructure	Infrastructure
*Emphasize retraining, enhanced management, and re-deployment of existing resources and infrastructure	(Recognize possible need for infrastructure changes (Technology, procurement, personnel)
Priorities	Priorities
*Focus on improvements	*Recognize need to focus on internal improvement strategy, as well as customer service (p. 34)

Implementing a 360-degree performance appraisal system clearly falls in a long-term plan. It will take nearly two years to completely implement. Implementation will require resources that are not available in the current operating budget. It is anticipated that it will cost approximately \$100,000.00 to get members of the department trained to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system. The infrastructure needs should be addressed as part of the current departmental technology upgrades. Priorities of Strategy #2, ‘recognize need to focus on

internal improvement strategy, as well as customer services” will be achieved if a 360-degree performance appraisal system is implemented.

Technology upgrades are a stumbling block for implementing a 360-degree performance appraisal system for the DCF&EMSD. On January 14, 1999, Mr. Weiss, the Management Information Systems Director for the DCF&EMSD, stated that the entire department should have online capabilities by the middle of May 1999. The delay was being caused by the need for several of the older fire stations to be wired with the proper telephone lines that would be capable of carrying data. Danny Weiss also felt that the USA Careers Program would not be difficult to teach to the department members. He believed it would be like teaching someone how to use e-mail.

The request for proposal was issued on November 27, 1998, by the District of Columbia Office of Personnel (DCOP). The request for proposal was for the new performance evaluation system. In the “Request for Proposal”, the deliverables section required a 360-degree performance appraisal component.

The contractor is to develop a system merge with Current Human Resources and Operating Environments. The contractor shall merge the existing components with the District’s environment, including USA Careers (a competency-based system and 360-Degree Assessment), and HR manager (performance appraisal component).

The contract has not been awarded at the writing of this research. The author has been asked to be a representative for the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department to DCOP on this city-wide project.

Fire Chief Donald Edwards wants the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department to be selected as a pilot program agency when the contract is awarded to a vendor. In order for

the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department to become a pilot program agency, there needs to be a plan available for the selected vendor to follow.

Ms. Crystal Marrow, DCOP Office of Policy, Standards, and Judicial Review, and Project Liaison with other agencies, stated on January 11, 1999, that the city had to make sure that the selected vendor could make the system work for the entire district government. Agencies could develop their own plans for implementation, but the vendor would be responsible for integrating all agency plans into the entire district government system.

4. Who are the key players in the change process, and what are the critical components and sequential order of tasks that will need to be accomplished in order to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system?

It is possible to identify key players, critical components, and a sequential order of tasks that will need to be accomplished to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system. Appendix A contains this plan. The development of the implementation plan for a 360-degree performance appraisal system was derived from several sources identified in the literature review. Kotter's 1996, identified The Eight-Stage Process of Creating Major Change. Frame, 1995, identified the Dynamics of the Project Life Cycle. By combining information from Kotter, Frame and Bryson, the plan was developed. As the plan was being formulated, there was an obvious relationship between Mayor William's Themes, Priorities, and Strategies, and Kotter's, Eight-Stage Process of Creating Major Change.

In Kotter, 1996, he discussed the eight-stage change process this way:

The methods used in the successful transformation are all based on one fundamental insight -- that major change will not happen easily for a long list of reasons. Even if an objective observer can clearly see that costs are too high, or

products are not good enough, or shifting customer requirements are not being adequately addressed, needed change can still be stalled because of inwardly focused cultures, paralyzing bureaucracy, parochial politics, a low level of trust, lack of team work, arrogant attitudes, lack of leadership in middle management, and the general human fear of the unknown. To be effective, a method, designed to alter strategies, reengineer processes, or improve quality, must address these barriers, and address them well. (p.20).

Kotter describes the eight steps to combat the major reasons why change will not happen easily: (i) establishing a sense of urgency, (ii) creating the guiding coalition, (iii) developing a vision and strategy, (iv) communicating the change vision, (v) empowering broad-based actions, (vi) generating short term wins, (vii) consolidating gains and producing more change, and (viii) anchoring new approaches in the culture (p.21).

Establishing a vision is part of Kotter's eight-step change process that discusses leadership versus management. The leader must share the vision and constantly communicate the vision with the organization's stakeholders. The leadership in a change process must empower members of the organization to overcome obstacles, encourage risk taking, create an environment where members of the organization can see the accomplishment, and the accomplishments are celebrated. Developing managers into leaders, becomes part of the organization's culture. (p.21).

Organizations that successfully complete a transformation feel compelled to change due to a sense of urgency. Establishing a sense of urgency is the first step in Kotter's change process (p.35).

In 1995, Frame, discussed the dynamics of the project life cycle. He identified that there must be a need, prior to project selection, followed by project planning, project implementation,

project control, evaluation and termination. However, there is constant feedback to the prior steps, except termination, and the feedback process constantly returns to project selection. His logic is that projects involve future commitments and costs. Therefore, organizations must always look to maximize opportunities when selecting and implementing a project. (p.9).

Projects that fail are the result of not properly assessing the politics of the project. Frame lists the following as the items that must constantly be examined as part of the project manager's political assessment:

1. Assess the environment;
2. Identify the goals of the principal actors;
3. Assess your own capabilities;
4. Define the problem;
5. Develop solutions; and
6. Test and refine the solutions.

The first four are designed to help project professionals acquire a realistic view of what is happening. Most project professionals, when tackling a project, skip over the first four steps and immediately begin offering solutions to the problems. These professionals are not good project politicians. Because all projects involve politics, and since these politics often have an important bearing on whether projects proceed smoothly or roughly, it is worthwhile to examine these steps in some detail. (p. 48).

In order to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal, each of the six items listed above will have to be watched closely. The political environment can change quickly in Washington, D.C.

Bryson stated: "Successful planning will result in smooth implementation of change in an organization." He continued that defining a strategic plan shapes and guides what an

organization is, what it does, and why it does it. To accomplish the goals of the plan, information must be compiled from a wide variety of sources, and it must as accurate as possible. Alternatives must be explored to meet future requirements. Bryson's statement that:

Strategic planning can help facilitate communication and participation, accommodation divergent interests and values, foster wise and reasonable analytic decision making, and prompt successful implementation. In short, at its best, strategic planning can prompt in organizations the kind of imaginative commitment -- that psychotherapist and theologian, Thomas Moore, thinks are necessary to deal with individuals' life conundrums. (p.5).

Political decisionmaking is the thread that makes the strategic planning process work for private, profit and nonprofit organizations. Every organization has politics, and any strategic plan must have been thought out with the politics of the organization in mind. The plan must achieve consensus on the organizational goals, policies, programs and actions in order to survive the political challenges and internal and external environment of the organization. "Strategy Change Cycle" is the term used by Bryson to describe how organization can implement their strategic plans.(p.23).

Kotter, Frame and Bryson offer insight into preparing a roadmap to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system. In addition, they offer solutions on how to deal with the project problems. The goal of this plan is to identify key players, critical components and a sequential order of tasks for implementation. However, evaluation and contingency planning will be ongoing during any implementation attempt, and would be under the control of the vendor who is awarded the contract with DCOP. The goal is to build a implementation plan that will be appealing to the contracted vendor with DCOP, and for the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department to be selected for a pilot program.

DISCUSSION

The DCF&EMSD has an opportunity to develop an implementation plan to improve the leadership and management skills of department officers through feedback they will receive from 360-degree performance appraisals. The research conducted by this author in 1998, coupled with the responses received from the officers used in the pilot program and the directions received from the new Mayor, clearly indicate that the time is now to put forth a plan to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system for the department.

John Kotter's eight-stage process of creating major change clearly focuses on the goals being established by Mayor Williams. The first step, establishing a sense of urgency, happened when Mayor Williams decided to run for office. Once elected, he demanded that Congress and the Control Board restore power to the Mayor's Office that had been removed in 1997. Step two is creating the guiding coalition. The Mayor Elect quickly surrounded himself with a transition team that included former Senate Leader Robert Dole, and other high political leaders, who, at many times, were on opposite ends of the political spectrum. The transition team started building unity throughout the city in support of the Mayor's vision (step 3) -- which was to restore Washington, D.C. to the greatest city in the world. The Mayor's vision involves meeting the expectations of the citizens for better services sooner, for a more effective and efficient government, and actions and decisions -- not studies and theories. Mayor Williams wants plans to implement improvements.

Mayor Williams started step four (communicating the change vision) before he was elected on November 2, 1998, and has not stopped communicating the change vision. Step five (empowering broad-based actions) came on January 4, 1999 when he ordered his agency heads to take a risk and to develop plans for making changes in how the city will run, and to develop short and long-range plans.

Step 6 (generating short-term wins) will come in the next six months as agencies implement highly-visible improvements in the city government. Urgency was reinforced by the resignation of the Chief Management Officer, who was hired by the Control Board, and the Mayor saying he expected there to be casualties among agency heads, and for the first time in its history, the city announced a surplus in its budget (step 7 -- consolidating gains and producing more change). Now the Mayor is looking to implement step 8 (anchoring new approaches in the culture). (p.21).

Kotter's process discusses leadership versus management. The leader must share the vision and constantly communicate the vision with the organization's stakeholders. The leadership in a change process must empower members of the organization to overcome obstacles, encourage risk taking, create an environment where members of the organization can see the accomplishment, and the accomplishments are celebrated. Developing managers into leaders, becomes part of the organization's culture. (p.21).

DCF&EMSD has the opportunity to achieve a major cultural change over the next few years. Full circle or 360-degree performance appraisals should be at the forefront of this cultural change. Officers are taking advantage of the 360-degree feedback they received during their 1998 appraisal. Each officer has implemented a developmental plan to become a better leader and manager. The author and other department officers who are enrolled in or graduated from the Center for Excellence in Municipal Management have been exposed to 360-degree feedback. There is support for culture change in city government and risk-taking is being encouraged by Mayor Williams, and he will be expecting long-term plans that can change the culture of the District government.

In 1998, this author provided supporting research to implement a 360-degree performance appraisals system to anchor this cultural change:

When looking at implementing a performance appraisal system for officers of the DCF&EMSD, consideration must be given to what is of value to the organization. Will the performance appraisal system develop those officers into leaders and managers that hold the same values as the organization? The use of a 360-degree performance appraisal system is an instrument that can answer that question and perform these tasks.

The example by Hymes, (1996), is a description of why the fire service needs to give feedback to company officers from all angles -- supervisors, peers, co-workers and subordinates. The firefighter Tom asks to speak to the chief. Tom tells the chief there is a problem in the station, and that the problem is the captain. The problem has been going on for a long time and it is not getting better. Tom describes the captain as an autocratic supervisor, who is an iron fisted boss, and uses sarcastic and demeaning retorts on people when they show initiative (p. 109).

This type of situation happens when there is no feedback given to managers on their strengths and weaknesses. I have seen and worked for officers who act the same as this Captain. In almost every case, they quickly lose the respect of their co-workers, subordinates, and supervisors. Many have asked for feedback when they realized that people are not responding to them in a positive manner. (p. 36).

The officers who participated in the 1998 research took a risk when they agreed to be part of the pilot program. Each of these officers when asked to be part of the pilot program were given two guarantees. First, this author would not see their 360-degree performance appraisals. Second, arrangements would be made for someone to explain their appraisals to them and give them support in developing a plan to make them better leaders and managers.

Each of the officers were asked what portion of the appraisal focused on the type of feedback they needed. Everyone stated that all portions of the appraisal were needed, and one

officer had changed his mind from a negative response to a positive response after receiving his feedback.

In question two, each officer was asked if their feedback had identified strengths and weaknesses that they had not anticipated. Each officer stated that he had received information they had not anticipated, but most of the feedback was more positive than they were expecting.

When asked if they would recommend 360-degree performance appraisals for officers in the department, all officers replied that they would definitely recommend its use for officers in the department.

When asked if the feedback had helped them to focus on how to develop skills to make them better leaders and managers, everyone of the officers had already taken some type of action to make themselves better leaders and managers.

The common thread between each of these officers is that they are willing to try almost anything that they think of to make them better at their jobs. Hakaki, 1995, discusses how a manager deals with change says a lot about them.

Less effective managers dislike change. They prefer a work environment marked by predictability, order and stability. Many believe that turbulence in their firms is the “fault” of senior management; others feel it is temporary.

How do you look at change -- as a temporary evil, or as an appealing fact of life in business? Do you embrace it or try to avoid it? Are you energized by it, or are you happy only with order and stability? (p. 10)

The values of the city are changing and the need for better accountability and improved customer services will have to be embraced by the leaders and managers of the DCF&EMSD. Full-circle performance appraisals are a method to help the organization embrace these values (Herr, p. 38).

The officers in the 1998 research would welcome the opportunity to receive another 360-degree performance appraisal. These officers have all used their feedback in a personal development plan that ranges from having a coach/mentor, to enrollment in the Center for Excellence in Municipal Management.

In summary, the use of a 360-degree performance appraisal system for officers of the DCF&EMSD, holds the key to achieving the organizational values of accountability and improved delivery of services. In addition, the feedback from the 360-degree performance appraisal system will provide every officer with an opportunity to improve his leadership and management skills.

A long-term plan (two years) for implementation of a 360-degree performance appraisal system in the Fire and Emergency Medical Services should be developed and turned over to the decision-makers and the vendor awarded the DCOP contract for implementing performance evaluations. The Mayor wants plans, and developing an implementation plan for 360-degree performance appraisals is the type of cultural change needed for the Mayor's vision to become anchored in the culture.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the DCF&EMSD's leadership take advantage of the change environment that has been established by Mayor Williams, and move forward with a plan to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system for the officers of the department. This recommendation is based on the following factors: (i) it has been accepted by members who have had exposure to the benefits of 360-degree feedback as a developmental tool to improve their leadership and management skills; (ii) implementing a 360-degree performance appraisal system must be a long-term plan (two years) because technology upgrades and implementation contract vendors have not been selected as of the writing of this research; (iii) developing the

implementation plan for 360-degree performance appraisals now, and giving it to the selected contractor, should achieve the goal of the Fire Chief to have the agency selected for the pilot program.

Mayor Williams has demanded short-term (six months) plans and long-term (two years) plans from all city agency heads. The Fire Chief wants to be a pilot agency for implementing 360-degree performance appraisals, and DCOP supports this request.

In Herr, 1998, recommendations were made that should be considered as part of an implementation plan. The use of a USA Careers, 360-degree performance appraisal system proved to be an excellent feedback tool for the officers who were exposed to it in the pilot program. The USA Careers system uses 45 questions that measure 19 competencies. These competencies included items that are aligned with the values of more accountability and improved customer services. These examples include: client orientation, creative thinking, internal controls/integrity, team building, self direction, planning and evaluating, problem solving, leadership, managing diverse workforce, vision, and many more, but the feedback from these would benefit any officer of the DCF&EMSD.

The USA Careers program was overwhelmingly embraced by the officers who participated in the pilot program each recommend that the department use a 360-degree performance appraisal. In addition, they developed plans to improve their skills as leaders and managers based on the feedback they received. They all felt that the key to the success for any 360-degree performance appraisal system would be to have a rater who would be honest and just. Myers (1998) stated that the USA Careers program is available for use by the department. The cost should be minimal at this time and will be even less when the technology upgrades are completed.

It will be important to share the vision and explain the rewards of using a 360-degree performance appraisal system to every member of the department. Implementing this system will require negotiating with labor so they should be involved during every phase of implementation, even when it does not effect bargaining unit employees. Open and honest communications will be the key for implementation of a 360-degree performance appraisal system. The final goal would be to have a 360-degree performance appraisal system that would provide feedback to every member of the department that would allow them to develop into better leaders and managers.

The above recommendations are made with the hopes that the DCF&EMSD will have a performance appraisal system that provides the feedback needed to develop the potential leaders and managers of this department as it moves into the ever-changing future. I constantly think of a sidebar quote from Shavers, (1995) the quote is from Dick Beatty in “ Across the Board”, “ Without candor, you won’t have trust. Without trust, you won’t have risk-taking. And without risk-taking, you won’t have creativity and innovation (p.3). When you find someone with the traits of: candor, trust, risk-taking, creativity and innovation, you may have found a leader.” (p.42).

These comments must be considered when developing an implementation plan that will identify key players, critical components, and a sequential order of tasks that will need to be accomplished to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system.

Appendix A attached hereto contains an implementation plan for the contract vendor, that identifies key players, critical components and a sequential order of tasks.

REFERENCES

- Braddick, Carol A., Jones, Michael B. & Shafer, Paul M. (1992). A look at broadbanding in practice. Journal of Compensation and Benefit. July/August. 28-32.
- Bryson, John M. (1995). Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations. A Guide to Strengthening and Sustaining Organizational Achievement. San Francisco, CA.
- Bryson, John M. & Alston, Farnum K. (1995) Creating and implementing your strategic plan. A workbook for public and nonprofit organizations. San Francisco, CA.
- Colon, Rafael (1996). Use of 360 degree assessment by public-sector management. Employee Relations Today. Spring. 1-15.
- Cook, J. W. (1996). Economic Development in Washington, D.C. : Two tales of a city. The George Washington University School of Business and Public Management. Washington, D.C.
- District of Columbia Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department. (1951). Order book, Washington, D.C.
- Drucker, Peter F. (1966) The Effective Executive. Harper Business. New York, NY.
- Ducan, William R., Director of Standards. (1996). A guide to the project management body of knowledge. Project Management Institute. Upper Darby, PA.
- Fite, Richard R., Chief Procurement Officer, (1998) Request for proposal District of Columbia performance evaluation system. November. District of Columbia Officer of Contracting and Procurement. Washington, D.C.
- Frame, J. Davidson (1995). Managing Projects in Organizations. How to Make the best Use of Time, Techniques, and People. San Francisco, CA.

Gruner, Stephanie, (1997). Feedback from Everyone -- Are 360-degree performance reviews a silly fad -- or a smart management tool?. Inc. 19. (2), 102-103.

Hakaki, Oran, (1995). The successful manager in the new business world. Management Review 8. (4), 10-13.

Herr, Joseph A. (1998) Developing leaders and managers through the use of a 360-degree performance appraisal system. Executive Fire Officer's Program. Applied Research Project. National Fire Academy. Emmitsburg, MD.

Hymes, John, (1996). The bottom-up performance appraisal. Fire Chief. 40. (8), 109-116

Kotter, James P. (1996) Leading Change. Harvard Business School Press. Boston, MA.
Latham, Gary P. contributor to Fombrun, Charles, Ticht, Noel M, and Mary Anne Devanna, (1984). Strategic Human Resource Management. John Wiley & Sons. New York, NY.

Martin, Christine, & Mastenbrook, Carol, (1993). Is broad-banding right for your organization?. Journal of Compensation and Benefits. July/August. 23-28.

O'Reilly, Brian (1994). 360 feedback can change your life. Fortune, 10, 93-100.

Shaver, Warren, Jr. (1995). How to build and use a 360-degree feedback system. American Society For Training and Development. Alexandria, VA.

Slevin, Dennis P. & Pinto, Jeffery K. (1986). The project implementation profile: new tools for project managers. Project Management Journal. September. 57-65.

Wells, Prof. William G. Wells, Jr. (1997) Top Management Overview of Project Management. Program of Project Management. The George Washington University School of Business and Public Management. Washington, D.C.

Williams, Mayor Anthony (1999) Memorandum of Agreement. Washington, D.C.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

PLAN TO IMPLEMENT A 360-DEGREE PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Executive Summary:

The District of Columbia Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department (DCF&EMSD) must develop a strategic plan to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system for officers of the DCF&EMSD. This plan will be presented to the vendor who is awarded the contract issued by the District of Columbia Office of Personnel (DCOP).

On November 27, 1998, a request for proposal was issued by the District of Columbia Office of Personnel (DCOP). The request for proposal was for the new performance evaluation system. In the "Request for Proposal", the deliverables section required a 360-degree performance appraisal component.

The contractor is to develop a system merge with Current Human Resources and Operating Environments. The contractor shall merge the existing components with the District's environment, including USA Careers (a competency-based system and 360-Degree Assessment), and HR manager (performance appraisal component).

System Implementation: The contractor shall provide a plan for a pilot of the new system within various types of agencies with DCOP oversight.

Performance Evaluation Forms: These forms should include space for multiple raters.

On-line/Information Technology Component: This component will integrate the new performance evaluation system into the District's computer infrastructure. (p.12)

The contract has not been awarded at the writing of this research. The author has been asked to be a representative for the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department to DCOP on this city-wide project.

The contract calls for deliverables for (DCOP). One of the deliverables is to provide a plan for a pilot of the new system within various types of agencies with DCOP.

Oversight Performance Evaluation Forms: include space for multiple raters

On-line/Information Technology Component: that will integrate the new performance evaluation system into the District's computer infrastructure. (p.12)

The goal of this plan is to identify key players, critical components and a sequential order of tasks that need to be accomplished to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system. Fire Chief Donald Edwards wants the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department to be one of the agencies selected for the pilot program.

This implementation plan will be given to the contractor to be used in developing either a pilot program or the final product. This plan was developed by using several sources: Bryson, Kotter, and Frame. Information from this plan was incorporated into the computer program, Microsoft Project, which was used to develop a roadmap plan of tasks that must be accomplished and correlate their relationship to other tasks and the overall schedule.

This plan when implemented will provide 360-degree feedback to officers, holding them more accountable to their internal customers, which will spill over to the external customers. This performance feedback system can be used as a strategic plan that will provide the officers of the department with the feedback necessary to develop their skills as leaders and managers. Leaders and managers must change to meet the values of the city and department to have more accountability and improved customer service. Customer service will improve internally first, which will rapidly effect the citizens. Costs to citizens for implementation of a full-circle

appraisal system will be minimal because the program will be part of the city's technology upgrades. Implementing a 360-degree performance appraisal system for officers will require a shared vision that communicates the rewards of using a 360-degree performance appraisal system to every member of the department. Open and honest communications will be the key for implementation of a 360-degree performance appraisal system.

Background:

The election of the new Mayor, Anthony Williams, on November 2, 1998 and his taking office on January 2, 1999 created a vision for the city, and a sense of urgency for agency heads to provide better services to the citizens who live, visit or work in Washington, D.C. Mayor Williams expects meaningful plans, both long and short term, and 360-degree performance appraisals will meet this expectation.

Concerns were raised by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Authority (the Control Board), to the leadership of the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department about its performance appraisal system. The Control Board was appointed by President Clinton and Congress in 1995 to oversee the operations of the District of Columbia Government. In July 1997, the Control Board took over the day-to-day management of nine District Government agencies by an act of Congress. The Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department was one of the nine agencies. The Control Board has mandated that a new annual employee performance appraisal system be in place by July 1, 1998, for every member of the DCF&EMSD. The incentive for completing this mandate is its link to a 10% pay raise for department members effective October 1, 1998.

In September 1997, the Control Board had consultants perform an examination of the entire fire and emergency medical services department. A consultant recommendation was for the department to develop better leaders and managers. This recommendation became one of the

management reform projects that have been mandated for implementation in the department by the Control Board.

Implementation:

Implementation of a 360-degree performance appraisal system in the DCF&EMSD will require leadership and project support. The key players must be identified so their support and leadership will work for the implementation of 360-degree performance appraisal system.

The key players identified and their roles are listed in Table 1 below:

Key Player	For or Against	Role
Mayor Anthony Williams	For	New leaders who wants new long and short-term plans. Vision for City.
Control Board Members	For	Want performance appraisal system for all District government employees.
City Council	For/Against	Most will support; however, some may not support if they believe it is a mandate from Congress or the Control Board.
Congress	For/Against	Most will support; however, this involves politics and some in Congress do not support anything new for the District government.

Fire Chief Donald Edwards	For	Wants agency selected for pilot program. Supported research for projects to implement.
Assistant Fire Chiefs	For	Believe in providing feedback to officers for development.
Deputy Chief, Training	For	Authored research for plan.
Deputy Chiefs, Fire Fighting	For	Want better leaders and managers in charge of battalions and companies
A/Deputy Chief, Fire Prevention	For	Graduate of the Center for Excellence in Municipal Program and has experienced 360-degree appraisal
Battalion Chief, Fleet Main	For	Graduate of the Center for Excellence in Municipal Program and has experienced 360-degree appraisal
Battalion Chiefs	For/Against	This group has to support the project. If they do not support the project, it will not survive.
Captains	For/Against	Company commanders that are still in bargaining unit – believe most will support program.
Lieutenants	For/Against	Largest group of officers -- believe majority will support program.
Sergeants	For/Against	Lowest level officer – believe majority will support program.

Fire Fighters	For/Against	Believe majority will support because they will be raters, not ratees.
DCOP	For	Responsible for implementing performance evaluations for all District government employees, and have had input into this plan.
Center for Excellence in Municipal Management George Washington University	For	Supported project for 18 months.
Implementation Contractors	For/Against	Has not been selected as of this date and may not support this plan; however, the fire and EMS Department will have input into the implementation plan suggested by the contractor.
IAFF Union, Local 36	For/Against	Should support; however, must be educated and involved in process to protect their members' interests.

Each of these stakeholders play a key role in implementing a 360-degree performance appraisal system. This plan should be presented to the senior staff of the department. The presentation will give an overview of how a 360-degree performance appraisal system works, how it is used to develop leader and managers, and the expected results to be achieved. These senior managers will be given an opportunity to ask questions and make suggestion to the plan. Organizations call this process a “Murders Board” because senior staff have the potential to kill a

project. The advantage of using a murders board is because it establishes buy in and support from senior staff. Without their support, the project will fail. Failures of projects can be the result of not having a project champion. The fire chief must be the champion for implementing a 360-degree performance appraisal system.

The champion should maintain an atmosphere of cooperation with the union to implement this project. In an effort to build support for the project, it is recommend that the personnel outside of the bargaining unit (battalion fire chiefs and above) receive 360-degree performance appraisals first. Using management personnel will allow any problems areas with the system to be identified prior to conducting the appraisals on union personnel. Labor will see how well the system works from both a computer system stand point and a developmental stand point. Communications about this project must be constant between labor and management. Labor should be involved in decision processing that involve their members, and should be given an opportunity for input throughout the entire process. This will allow for labor to see results and have input into the development of the program prior to 360-degree performance appraisals being performed on members of Local 36.

The majority of the Human Resources for this project are members of Local 36. Human resources for this project have been identified and are shown in the Table 2 below.

ID		Resource Name	Initials	Number Personnel
1	⬇	Training Staff	TS	3
2	⬇	DC Office Personnel	DCOP	1
3	⬇	Center for Workforce Development	CWD	2
4	⬇	Technology Instructor	TI	2
5	⬇	Technology Advisor	TA	1
6	✓	Implementation Contractor	IC	10
7		Fire Dept Personnel	F	1765
8		Rater/Advisor	R	30

The human resources must be properly equipped if the project is going to be successful.

The equipment needs for this project are identified in Table 3 below.

ID	Facility	Equipment	Materials	Max Units
1	Training Academy	Overhead Proj, Screen, Vehicle, Computers	Lesson Plan, Handouts	300%
2	DCOP Offices			100%
3	CWD Offices			200%
4	Academy			200%
5	TA Office			100%
6	IC Office			1,000%
7	All Stations			17,650%
8	Training Academy			3,000%

The critical components for this project are identified in Table 4 below. The components are shown with time frames and completion dates.

ID	Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish
1	Implementing 360 degree performance appraisal	1058.25 days	Tue 1/13/98	Tue 9/26/00
2	Implement Technology Upgrades	735.75 days	Tue 1/13/98	Tue 11/30/99
3	Implement Upgrades	435 days	Tue 1/13/98	Tue 3/23/99
4	Train entire department as rater	180 days	Wed 3/24/98	Tue 11/30/99
5	Communicate Program	185.5 days	Fri 6/11/99	Tue 11/30/99
6	Develop Program Presentation	50.5 days	Fri 6/11/99	Tue 7/27/99
7	Develop Lesson Plans	33 days	Fri 6/11/99	Tue 7/27/99
8	Develop Printed Handouts	33 days	Fri 6/11/99	Tue 7/27/99
9	Pick 30 Rater/Advisors	47 days	Fri 6/11/99	Tue 7/27/99
10	Schedule 30 Program Presentations	90 days	Wed 7/28/99	Tue 11/30/99
11	Rater/Advisor Training	114.5 days	Tue 6/1/99	Wed 9/15/99
12	Develop 80 hour Rater/Advisor Training Course	67 days	Tue 6/1/99	Wed 9/1/99
13	Center for Workforce Development Course	10 days	Thu 9/2/99	Wed 9/15/99
14	Ratee's Results and Development Program	306.5 days	Wed 12/1/99	Mon 9/11/00
15	360s Performed on Ratees	84 days	Wed 12/1/99	Tue 2/22/00
16	Schedule Appointment with Advisor	68 days	Sat 1/1/00	Fri 3/10/00
17	Produce Developmental Plan for Ratee	68 days	Sat 1/1/00	Fri 3/10/00
18	Evaluation of Ratee's Progress	42 days	Tue 8/1/00	Mon 9/11/00
19	Program Evaluation	322.5 days	Wed 12/1/99	Tue 9/26/00
20	Survey Evaluation	310.5 days	Wed 12/1/99	Fri 9/15/00
21	Write Survey	21 days	Wed 12/1/99	Tue 12/21/99
22	Distribute Survey	30 days	Mon 7/17/00	Fri 8/25/00
23	Compile Survey Results	15 days	Mon 8/28/00	Fri 9/15/00
24	Report Recommendations	9 days	Sat 9/16/00	Tue 9/26/00

The sequential order of the tasks that will be required to implement a 360-degree performance appraisal system are shown in Table 5.

In order to keep key players, critical components and the sequential order in focus, a Work Breakdown Structure has been developed for this project. This will identify human resource needs and tasks throughout the duration of the project. The work breakdown structure is shown in Table 5 below.

ID	Name	WBS
1	Implementing 360 degree performance appraisal	
	<i>Training Staff</i>	
	<i>DC Office Personnel</i>	
	<i>Center for Workforce Development</i>	
	<i>Technology Instructor</i>	
	<i>Technology Advisor</i>	
	<i>Implementation Contractor</i>	
	<i>Fire Dept Personnel</i>	
2	Implement Technology Upgrades	1.0
	<i>Training Staff</i>	
	<i>Technology Instructor</i>	
	<i>Technology Advisor</i>	
	<i>Implementation Contractor</i>	
3	Implement Upgrades	
	<i>Fire Dept Personnel</i>	
4	Train entire department as rater	1.1
	<i>Training Staff</i>	
	<i>Technology Instructor</i>	
	<i>Technology Advisor</i>	
	<i>Implementation Contractor</i>	
5	Communicate Program	2.0
	<i>Training Staff</i>	
	<i>DC Office Personnel</i>	
	<i>Center for Workforce Development</i>	
	<i>Technology Instructor</i>	
	<i>Technology Advisor</i>	
	<i>Implementation Contractor</i>	
	<i>Fire Dept Personnel</i>	
6	Develop Program Presentation	

ID	Name	WBS
	<i>Training Staff</i>	
	<i>DC Office Personnel</i>	
	<i>Center for Workforce Development</i>	
	<i>Technology Instructor</i>	
	<i>Technology Advisor</i>	
	<i>Implementation Contractor</i>	
	<i>Fire Dept Personnel</i>	
7	Develop Lesson Plans	2.2
	<i>Training Staff</i>	
8	Develop Printed Handouts	2.3
	<i>Training Staff</i>	
9	Pick 30 Rater/Advisors	2.4
	<i>Training Staff</i>	
	<i>DC Office Personnel</i>	
	<i>Center for Workforce Development</i>	
	<i>Technology Instructor</i>	
	<i>Technology Advisor</i>	
	<i>Implementation Contractor</i>	
	<i>Fire Dept Personnel</i>	
10	Schedule 30 Program Presentations	2.1
	<i>Training Staff</i>	
11	Rater/Advisor Training	3.0
	<i>Training Staff</i>	
	<i>DC Office Personnel</i>	
	<i>Center for Workforce Development</i>	
	<i>Technology Instructor</i>	
	<i>Technology Advisor</i>	
	<i>Implementation Contractor</i>	
	<i>Fire Dept Personnel</i>	

ID	Name	WBS
12	Develop 80 hour Rater/Advisor Training Course	
	Training Staff	
	DC Office Personnel	
	Center for Workforce Development	
	Technology Instructor	
	Technology Advisor	
	Implementation Contractor	
13	Center for Workforce Development Course	3.1
	Training Staff	
	Center for Workforce Development	
	Implementation Contractor	
14	Ratee's Results and Development Program	4.0
	Training Staff	
	DC Office Personnel	
	Implementation Contractor	
	Fire Dept Personnel	
	Rater/Advisor	
15	360s Performed on Ratees	4.1
	Training Staff	
	DC Office Personnel	
	Implementation Contractor	
	Fire Dept Personnel	
	Rater/Advisor	
16	Schedule Appointment with Advisor	4.2
	Fire Dept Personnel	
	Rater/Advisor	
17	Produce Developmental Plan for Ratee	4.3
	Fire Dept Personnel	
	Rater/Advisor	

ID	Name	WBS
18	Evaluation of Ratee's Progress	4.4
	DC Office Personnel	
	Fire Dept Personnel	
	Rater/Advisor	
19	Program Evaluation	5.0
	Training Staff	
	DC Office Personnel	
	Center for Workforce Development	
	Technology Instructor	
	Technology Advisor	
	Implementation Contractor	
	Fire Dept Personnel	
20	Survey Evaluation	5.1
	Training Staff	
	DC Office Personnel	
	Center for Workforce Development	
	Technology Instructor	
	Technology Advisor	
	Implementation Contractor	
	Fire Dept Personnel	
21	Write Survey	5.1.1
	Training Staff	
	DC Office Personnel	
	Center for Workforce Development	
	Technology Instructor	
	Technology Advisor	
	Implementation Contractor	
	Fire Dept Personnel	
22	Distribute Survey	

ID	Name	WBS
	<i>Training Staff</i>	
	<i>DC Office Personnel</i>	
	<i>Center for Workforce Development</i>	
	<i>Implementation Contractor</i>	
23	Compile Survey Results	5.1.2
	<i>Training Staff</i>	
	<i>DC Office Personnel</i>	
	<i>Center for Workforce Development</i>	
	<i>Implementation Contractor</i>	
24	Report Recommendations	5.2
	<i>Training Staff</i>	
	<i>DC Office Personnel</i>	
	<i>Center for Workforce Development</i>	
	<i>Technology Instructor</i>	
	<i>Technology Advisor</i>	
	<i>Implementation Contractor</i>	
	<i>Fire Dept Personnel</i>	